DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 952 CE 034 727

AUTHOR Beason, Elaine
TITLE Vocational Education for the Handicapped: Perspectives on Certification. Personnel Development Series: Document 3.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Leadership Training Inst./Vocational and Special Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE May 82
GRANT G007900952
NOTE 32p.; For related documents see ED 211 720, CE 034 699-700, and CE 034 726-730.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disabilities; Faculty Development; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Secondary Education; *Special Education Teachers; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; Teaching Skills; *Vocational Education; *Vocational Education Teachers

ABSTRACT

This document is a monograph in a personnel development series addressing issues that are pertinent for policy-making personnel concerned with teacher certification and personnel preparation of those who service handicapped students on the secondary level. The discussion is divided into three major sections. Section 1 focuses on trends in teacher certification and personnel preparation. Section 2 offers guidelines for creating changes in teacher certification and personnel training. Three avenues through which changes could be facilitated are discussed: interagency collaboration, professional organization involvement, and individual professional attitude change. Section 3 describes two personnel preparation models that are examples of certification emphasizing vocational education and special education. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224952

Vocational Education for the Handicapped: Perspectives on Certification

Personnel Development Series: Document 3

Edited by

Janet M. Treichel
Office of Career Development for Special Populations
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Contributing Author

Elaine Beason
Fort Hays State University
Fort Hays, Kansas

A Publication of the
LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE/ VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

Office of Career Development for Special Populations
College of Education
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Sponsored by

Division of Personnel Preparation
Office of Special Education
U.S. Department of Education

CE 034 187

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Treichel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

May 1982

FOREWORD

Over the past decade the problems and difficulties that face handicapped youth in their efforts to obtain and maintain employment have been widely documented by researchers, public policy analysts, and advocacy organizations. In the 1970s the U.S. Congress enacted several pieces of education, training, and employment legislation to focus, in part, on resolving these problems. The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, along with the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1978, and several civil rights initiatives, placed priority upon assuring that handicapped youth receive appropriate vocational education programs and services. These various pieces of legislation acknowledged the concurrent need for staff development and teacher education programs to assure that effective programs and services are delivered. Within the vocational education, special education, rehabilitation, and CETA systems there are nearly a million professionals--the vast majority of whom have limited or no expertise in planning and providing comprehensive vocational programs and services for disabled youth and adults. The need for training programs to update teachers, support personnel, counselors, coordinators, and administrators is great. There is also an enormous need for training other individuals (such as employers, parents, advocates, co-workers, non-disabled peers) if youths with special needs are to be successful in their transition from school to work.

Planning and conducting effective personnel development programs that serve the career development needs of handicapped youth involves a variety of complex tasks. Developing appropriate interagency, collaborative training arrangements is essential to insure that current knowledge and expertise is

utilized from the fields of vocational education, special education, rehabilitation, career development, and employment and training. Decisions must be made relative to the specific training needs of the target audience. Frequently, the needs of inservice practitioners must be considered along with the needs of trainees who are preparing to enter the field for the first time. The question of student needs is also present. The process of providing vocational education for severely handicapped youths is, by nature of the students served and the training technology, considerably different from training mildly handicapped youth. Other critical dimensions related to the content of personnel development encompass such areas as: vocational assessment, career guidance, and evaluation of training programs. The need for and patterns of personnel certification in the field of vocational/special education is also a continuing concern for personnel development programs.

During 1980-82 the University of Illinois hosted a series of three conferences which focused upon improving personnel preparation programs in vocational/special education. These conferences were conducted as part of the Leadership Training Institute/Vocational and Special Education, which was supported by a grant from the Division of Personnel Preparation, Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. As individuals responsible for personnel preparation programs in vocational/special education met and shared their experiences and concerns, a clear need emerged for a series of monographs on designing, implementing, and evaluating personnel development programs. The need to address the critical questions and identify effective policies and practices related to personnel development was obvious following the initial conference held in Champaign, Illinois in April 1980. The project staff used a small advisory group of individuals attending the conferences to outline the Perspectives monograph series. Needs assessment data

collected during and prior to the first conference was used by the group in identifying the major topics to be addressed in the series. Staff involved in the vocational/career education projects funded by the Division of Personnel Preparation were then invited to become members of the various monograph writing teams. Under the expert guidance of Dr. Janet Treichel, LTI Training and Dissemination Coordinator, the writing teams formulated their monographs to focus on such core components as: present state-of-the-art, effective policies and practices, and guidelines for personnel development programs. Dr. Treichel coordinated the planning and preparation of the series in a highly exemplary manner. Her leadership, commitment to excellence, and professional insight were valuable assets in editing this series.

The monograph topics in the Perspectives on Personnel Development series include: Special Populations/Severely and Moderately Handicapped, Certification, Program Evaluation, Effective Interagency/Interdepartmental Coordination, Inservice Personnel Development, Vocational Assessment, Preservice Personnel Preparation, and Career Development/Guidance.

We anticipate that the monographs will be useful resource documents for a variety of audiences. Teacher educators and administrators in higher education will find the series helpful in planning both preservice and inservice programs for special educators, vocational educators, counselors, educational administrators, rehabilitation specialists, and others. State education agencies involved in certification, personnel development, and program administration will find strategies, and suggestions for reviewing, evaluating, and formulating teacher training efforts in local agencies and universities. The monographs are also a rich source of ideas for parent and advocacy groups and professional associations as they seek to improve the knowledge and competence of personnel serving handicapped youth.

This series represents a significant compilation of important and timely perspectives on personnel development in vocational/special education. It contains the wisdom and insight of nearly 50 leaders in the field. We feel it will be a valuable and important resource in improving the "appropriateness" of the programs and services received by the handicapped youths of our nation.

L. Allen Phelps
Director
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education

George Hagerty
Project Officer
Division of Personnel Preparation
U.S. Department of Education

PREFACE

The Perspectives on Personnel Development series has become a reality due to the efforts of a number of individuals. These people were highly instrumental in the development, planning, and publication phases of the monographs.

Appreciation and gratitude is extended posthumously to Margaret (Meg) Hensel. Meg was actively involved in assisting in planning for the personnel preparation conferences and the initial developmental stages for this series. We will continue to miss her enthusiasm and dedicated efforts.

The LTI is indebted to Dr. Elaine Beason of Fort Hays State University for her leadership in the development of this monograph. Dr. Beason has been actively conducting research, development, and training programs focusing on certification concerns in vocational/special needs. This document addresses a number of issues that are pertinent for policy-making personnel concerned with teacher certification and personnel preparation.

The reviewers for the Perspectives series also made important and significant contributions. Dr. Gary Clark of the University of Kansas reviewed each monograph in the series. Dr. Robert Henderson of University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Dr. Sidney Miller of Southern Illinois University--Carbondale served as reviewers for the Perspectives on Certification monograph. Their insightful comments and suggestions were very helpful in the preparation of the monograph.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to Ms. Alicia Bollman, Ms. Nancy Verbout, and Ms. June Chambliss for their dedicated efforts and patience in providing the secretarial expertise necessary to produce this volume.

Janet Treichel, Editor
Coordinator, Training and Dissemination
Leadership Training Institute/
Vocational and Special Education

Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
TRENDS IN TEACHER CERTIFICATION AND PERSONNEL PREPARATION	4
GUIDELINES FOR CHANGE	14
Interagency Collaboration	14
Professional Organization Involvement	15
Professional Attitude Change	16
Summary	17
EXAMPLES OF CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS	18
Vocational Education Orientation	18
Special Education Orientation	20
SUMMARY	23
CONCLUSIONS	24
REFERENCES	25

The state of the art of certification for personnel who serve handicapped students on the secondary level is almost nonexistent in both special education and vocational education. This situation exists for some obvious and some not so obvious reasons. Among the more obvious reasons are:

1. Indecisiveness as to what specifically constitutes a comprehensive secondary level program for handicapped students.
2. Indecisiveness or lack of agreement as to necessary teacher competencies to implement a comprehensive secondary level program for handicapped students.

Consequent to the two above statements, certification standards and guidelines have not been devised in most states.

This current situation has become a national level concern. Even though this concern has existed among special educators in secondary schools for many years, it has now reached a level of prominence among other national educational concerns. Such prominence is a result of many influential factors. Probably the most significant factor is that past and current professional preparation and training practices have been cited as a barrier to providing appropriate education for the handicapped (Heller, 1981; Miller, Sabatino & Larsen, 1980; Miller, 1975; and Clark & Olverson, 1973). Professional preparation, or rather the lack of appropriate training, has been cited as a barrier due to the historical orientation of college courses at the elementary level as opposed to specialized training in program development and implementation for handicapped high school students (Heller, 1981).

A second factor that has influenced the emergence of the concern to a national level is the continuing inconsistency and lack of congruence among teacher educators, state and local education administrative personnel, and teachers (special, regular, and vocational) regarding what constitutes appropriate programming on the secondary level and, consequently, necessary teacher competencies. A significant study that demonstrated this inconsistency was published by Miller, Sabatino, and Larsen (1980) in which data were collected from university special education faculty and local education agency administrators of special education in six states in the north central United States. It was reported that statistically significant differences existed between university personnel and special education administrators in the areas of (a) necessary teacher competencies and (b) appropriateness of differentiation of teacher certifications according to grade levels (K-6 and 7-12). University personnel preferred special educator certification with a K-12 parameter as opposed to K-6 and 7-12 which were preferred by special education administrators. This was interpreted to mean that university personnel did not agree with special education administrators that teacher competencies should be developed according to an elementary or secondary level emphasis.

Other factors that have supported the questioning of current personnel preparation practices are: (a) the increasing number of secondary level identified handicapped students who are receiving services in the least restrictive environments, (b) the increasing number of handicapped students who graduate from high school unskilled in a vocation or unprepared to continue their education which consequently leads to un- or underemployment, and (c) the emerging conversativeness of the nation which will force higher levels of accountability.

This monograph will focus on: (a) trends in teacher certification and personnel preparation, (b) guidelines for creating changes in teacher certification and personnel training, and (c) descriptions of two personnel preparation models that are examples of certification programs emphasizing vocational education and special education.

Trends in Teacher Certification and Personnel Preparation

The state of the art in certification of professionals who provide vocational/career education for the handicapped can best be presented by a discussion of the trends in certification requirements. A significant monograph written by Brock, Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work With Special Needs Students--State of the Art 1977 (ERIC No. ED 14 9518), was printed in 1977. This monograph presented data which clarified the lack of preparation of secondary level personnel who served special needs students. It brought to light the disparity of emphasis between elementary and secondary preparation of special needs personnel. Replication results of the 1977 study were presented in 1979, Preparing Vocational and Special Education Personnel to Work With Special Needs Students--State of the Art 1977-1979 (Brock 1979). As a result of this longitudinal study, the following observations and recommendations were made:

1. Program development is viable and growing, yet slow. It was concluded that the number of operational programs--programs that specifically trained vocational/special needs professionals--has increased from 25 in 1977 to 36 in 1979. These programs went beyond the mandated coursework in special education required of all teachers (in states that had such a requirement). A reported 730 program graduates in 1979 as opposed to 166 in 1977 demonstrated a more specific growth pattern.
2. Programs that add on a course to existing programs or combine two separate programs are not the best approaches to training

personnel. It was concluded that training programs designed specifically for personnel who work with special needs students offered the optimal preparation. Such a program would contain its own philosophy, program goals, curricula, evaluation system, and teaching methodology among other aspects of a training program. It would not be eclectic in that bits and pieces would not be taken from other training programs (i.e., mental retardation, learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, physical handicaps, or vocational education) and combined to formulate a new training program. An appropriate training program would be one that prepares professionals to offer specialized services to meet the multi-dimensional needs of special needs students.

3. More precise communication between university training programs and state teacher certification officials should take place. This would alleviate some of the confusion about "who is offering what" in regard to professional training.

4. University training programs should increase and improve dissemination activities so that more individuals can become knowledgeable about offerings.

5. The mandated requirement of special education coursework for all certified teachers is best met by designing courses that address adaptations of regular (including vocational) classrooms, teaching techniques, materials, and equipment.

Brock viewed the state of the art in preparing vocational and special education personnel to work with special needs students as transitionally dynamic. In 1979 there were individuals who were becoming aware of the necessity to provide vocational/career education for special needs students, and there were others who were already providing such programs. The

field was observed to be growing and developing despite contravening political interests and resistance to change that is often imposed upon innovators.

Brock's (1979) publication included a breakdown by states as to required special education coursework for all teachers, specialized training for special fields personnel (vocational education, industrial arts), and awareness of vocational/career oriented training programs. Data were obtained by direct telephone interviews with forty-eight state certification officials. A replication of the 1977 and 1979 studies was made by this writer in 1981 to investigate possible changes. The responses obtained in 1977, 1979, and 1981 appear in Table 1. Eight states required some special education preparation of all teachers in 1977 compared to 14 in 1979 and 22 in 1981. This increase signified a definite trend. Obviously, if all teachers were required to take special education coursework, then secondary level teachers who work with special needs students would be included. This does not indicate, however, a requirement of specialized coursework for secondary level personnel. The requirement was for special education coursework which did not differentiate among a kindergarten teacher, high school English teacher, or vocational educators.

It was reported in 1979 (Brock) that no states required additional special education coursework for vocational educators and other special field personnel beyond the requirement for all teachers. This finding changed in the 1981 replication with Minnesota and Pennsylvania interviewees reporting that extra coursework in special education, beyond general requirements, was a requirement for vocational educators and other special field personnel.

Table 1
Perceptions of State Certification Officers Regarding State Teacher Certification Requirements

	QUESTIONS		
STATE	1. All teachers required to have spec. educ. coursework 1977/1979/1981	2. Special fields teachers required to have spec. educ. coursework 1977/1979/1981	3. Presence of voc/ career oriented special educ. program 1977/1979/1981
Alabama	No/No/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Arizona	Yes/Yes/No	No/No/No	No/No/No
Arkansas	No/No/No	No/No/No	No/Yes/Yes
California	No/No/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Colorado	Yes/Yes/Yes	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Connecticut	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Delaware	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Yes/No
Florida	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Georgia	Yes/Yes/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Not Aware/Yes
Idaho	No/No/No	No/No/No	Yes/Not Aware/Don't Know
Illinois	No/No/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Indiana	No/No/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/No/No
Iowa	No/No/No	No/No/No	Yes/Not Aware/Yes
Kansas	No/No/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Yes/Don't Know
Kentucky	Yes/Yes/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/No/No
Louisiana	Yes/Yes/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Maine	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Maryland	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Massachusetts	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Michigan	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Minnesota	No/No/No	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Yes/Yes
Mississippi	No/No/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Yes/Yes
Missouri	Yes/Yes/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Montana	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Nebraska	No/No/No	No/No/Don't Know	Not Aware/Yes/Don't Know
Nevada	No/Yes/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
New Hampshire	No/No/Yes	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
New Jersey	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
New Mexico	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
New York	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/Yes
North Carolina	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Yes/yes
North Dakota	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Yes/Yes
Oklahoma	Yes/Yes/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Oregon	No/No/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Ohio	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Pennsylvania	No/No/No	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Yes/Yes
Rhode Island	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
South Dakota	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/Yes
South Carolina	No/No/Yes	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Tennessee	No/Yes/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Texas	No/Yes/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Yes/No
Utah	No/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
Vermont	Yes/No/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Yes/Yes
Virginia	No/Yes/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/Yes
Washington	No/Yes/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Not Aware/No
West Virginia	No/Yes/No	No/No/No	Not Aware/Yes/No
Wisconsin	No/No/Yes	No/No/Yes	Yes/Yes/No
Wyoming	No/Yes/Yes	No/No/Yes	Not Aware/Yes/Yes

A third area of questioning in the three investigations concerned the knowledge of vocational/career oriented training programs (not necessarily certification) in the respondent's respective state. In 1981, 13 state certification personnel reported the existence of vocational/career oriented training programs in their states. In 1977, three states reported such a program and in 1979 there were 13. The significance between the 1979 and 1981 results was the inconsistency of individual states. For example, in 1979 Kansas reported three training programs. The state certification officials contacted in 1981 responded by reporting no training programs in the state containing a vocational/career orientation. Since training programs did exist in Kansas during the 1981 interview, one must conclude a lack of communication between the state department of education and institutions conducting training programs, or an influx of state department personnel who were not yet familiar with state training programs. Six states reported a change from the presence of a training program(s) in 1979 to no training program with a vocational/career orientation in 1981. Five of the six states that reported having no training program(s) were listed in 1979-80 and 1980-81 Directory and Program Information for the OSE Vocational/Career Education Projects as having a total of eight funded programs.

In summation, there have been definite trends of progress in personnel training of individuals who serve secondary level special needs students. Even though the movement is slow, positive changes have been identified. The most positive change and obvious trend has been the increase in the number of states requiring all teachers to take special education coursework to continue or obtain certification. An increase from eight states in 1977 to 22 states in 1981 having this requirement, has

resulted in a significant number of teachers, including secondary level, being exposed to special education training.

A somewhat less positive statement must be made about specialized training of secondary level teachers, other than special educators, who serve special needs students. Only two (Minnesota and Pennsylvania) of the 48 contiguous states reported a required special training emphasis of these professionals. If specialized training was received in the other 46 states, it was due to institutional programming rather than state requirement.

It was found that state certification officials increased in their reported awareness of vocational/career oriented training programs in their state from 1977 to 1979, but not from 1979 to 1981 even though there was an actual increase in the number of OSE supported projects or project subcomponents. The possible reasons for this are too numerable to state in this document.

In the 1981 directed telephone interviews with state certification officials, 13 states reported special education certification distinction between elementary and secondary training. A majority of these states' officials conveyed the fact that the actual training distinction was in practicum experiences and a secondary-school emphasis in existing coursework as opposed to a program with total or major emphasis on the secondary level. Furthermore, no state certification official reported a certification that combined special education and vocational education training. Apparently, investigation for data of such programs would be more efficacious through institutional contact rather than state certification departmental interview.

A second indication of trends in teacher certification and personnel preparation of those who provide services for secondary level handicapped students has been the increasing number of projects and program subcomponents funded under the vocational/career education priority of the Office of Special Education (OSE), Division of Personnel Preparation, U.S. Department of Education. There were 64 projects and/or program subcomponents supported during 1979-1980, and 72 during 1980-1981. Thirty-one and thirty-five states were represented in 1979-80 and 1980-81 respectively.

This increasing support from OSE has been critical to the development of personnel training programs (preservice and inservice) that emphasize vocational/career education for the handicapped. Historically, institutions of higher education have made few changes in offerings or program emphasis without additional economic support. Therefore, because of OSE funding, teacher educators have been allowed the flexibility to make program changes, add new coursework, and offer professional training in vocational/career education for the handicapped. With such changes taking place in 35 states with 72 projects or program subcomponents, one could assume that progress has occurred. Extrapolation of the number involved has revealed that an impact is being made on secondary level handicapped students, their families, and communities. Hopefully, this impact will influence positive steps toward certification of professionals who are being trained in vocational/career education for the handicapped.

The 72 OSE (1980-1981) supported projects and program subcomponents mentioned previously represented various degrees of emphasis of the vocational/career education priority with many implementation approaches. Some projects with extensive personnel preparation for work-study coor-

dinators, vocational-adjustment specialists, and/or career development specialists offered an emphasis in vocational/career education for the handicapped by add-on coursework for categorically trained special educators, vocational educators, and secondary level regular educators.

No one approach to personnel preparation has demonstrated a superiority over others. A best approach may never be realized due to various populations of professionals to be trained (special, vocational and regular educators), demographically oriented needs, and teacher trainer philosophies which would necessitate various approaches to training and, ultimately, certification.

The previous discussion has presented trends in teacher certification and personnel preparation. Two longitudinal studies supported the contention that movement toward specific certification of professionals who serve secondary level handicapped students has been extremely slow and almost nonexistent. However, special education coursework for all teachers has become a requirement in 22 states (out of 48 contiguous states) which represents a 29 percent increase from 1977 certification requirements.

The number of OSE supported programs under the vocational/career education priority was utilized to demonstrate a trend in personnel preparation. The contention was made that such support could serve as a possible impact and consequent influence toward state level support in teacher certification.

Guidelines for Change

Historically changes in education have been slow. Changes, at times, have been laggardly unresponsive to needs. By the time some changes occurred, it was time to create new changes. This has been the case in certification of personnel who work with secondary level handicapped students.

The reasons for the current state of the art are many. They span from individual professional turfism to state and federal bureaucratic power struggles. Therefore, guidelines for creating changes in the current state of the art of teacher certification would require a scope of activity beyond the limits of this monograph. However, there are avenues through which changes could be facilitated. Three such avenues, among others, could be (a) interagency collaboration (local, state, and federal), (b) professional organization involvement, and (c) individual professional attitude change.

Interagency Collaboration

Interagency collaboration has long been a goal among special educators, vocational educators, and rehabilitation specialists. Cooperative efforts offer comprehensive services for handicapped individuals utilizing expertise from all agencies without duplication of time, energy, and expenses. In the late 1970s impetus for changes in interagency collaboration was made by encouragement from the United States Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration and the United States Commissioner of Education. This encouragement came through memoranda to state education agency officers and state vocational rehabilitation directors who were encouraged to (a) investigate for collaborative efforts taking place (Federal

Register, October 3, 1977), (b) develop agreements to further cooperative efforts (Commissioner's Joint Memorandum, November 21, 1978), and (c) implement agreements by offering comprehensive vocational education services to the handicapped (Federal Register, September 25, 1978). The first two directives have taken place. The third and most comprehensive, unfortunately, will not be reached for some time. An indepth discussion of interagency collaboration presented by Albright and others (1981) listed activities for establishment of cooperative agreements. These activities, once implemented, would lead to (a) more comprehensive services, (b) defined professional roles and, consequently, (c) personnel competencies necessary for fulfillment of roles. This, in turn, would encourage higher levels of professionalism and alleviate inconsistencies of services offered, delivery methods, personnel training, and inter-state certifications. To reiterate, when comprehensive vocational education services are provided to handicapped individuals secondary effects might lead to more pragmatic professional training and certification. Many changes would have to take place, especially at the state and local level, before these secondary effects would be realized.

Professional Organization Involvement

National, state, and local professional organizations whose memberships represent special educators, vocational educators, and rehabilitation specialists have facilitated an increasing degree of professionalism. Through sponsorship of international, national and state conferences, workshops, and conventions professionals have been able to collaborate with and motivate others. Publications, such as, Career Development for Exceptional Individuals (Council for Exceptional Children--Division on Career Development), The Journal for Vocational Special Needs (American

Vocational Association of Vocational Education Special Needs Personnel), and Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin have been instrumental in disseminating research, methodologies, and philosophies. These forums have been motivational in unifying efforts and increasing professionalism among individuals who serve secondary level handicapped and special needs students. The memberships of these professional organizations have continued to increase to the point that there is a substantial impetus toward national and state level recognition of the need to clarify roles and competencies and regulate personnel training through certification requirements. In other words, the increase in the number of individuals who hold membership in the previously mentioned organizations has provided the needed thrust toward organization of personnel training and, hopefully, certification.

Professional Attitude Changes

One of the most difficult areas in which to create change is in the mental attitudes of special and vocational educators and rehabilitation specialists concerning the parameters of their expertise and possessiveness of the handicapped. Each domain has staked a claim on the handicapped. It has not yet been decided whether the handicapped population is primarily (a) special education students needing vocational education and/or rehabilitation services, (b) vocational education students needing special education, or (c) high school students needing special and vocational education. Professionals have adhered to the area in which they serve resulting in inconsistent and uncomprehensive services as well as duplication of services for the handicapped.

If those who serve secondary level handicapped students desire professional recognition through certification, mental attitudes and turfism

must first be changed to reflect mutual respect and the use of all expertise to best meet individual student needs.

Summary

Guidelines for creating changes in the current state of the art in certification have been presented by a discussion of three related areas of concentration. Interagency collaboration has been presented as a critical factor in the advancement toward certification. This collaboration could consequently delineate professional roles and competencies. Once professional roles and competencies have been agreed upon, then specific state procedures would need to follow to develop regulations for professional training and the awarding of professional certificates.

Professional organizations such as the American Vocational Association, Council for Exceptional Children, and National Rehabilitation Association have been cited as vehicles through which progress toward certification has been made. Conferences and publications have brought professionals together to exchange ideas and philosophies as well as develop an awareness that all involved individuals have the same goals--to serve handicapped and special needs individuals. The third area of concentration offered as a guideline for change was the mental attitudes of professionals who display possessiveness and unrealistic superiority over other helping disciplines. These three areas of concern could, if utilized to the fullest extent, provide vehicles toward more state certification programs, state and national consistency in training, and national recognition of the area as an entity.

Examples of Certification Programs

Although the numbers are not great, there is an increasing incidence of states offering certification for personnel who provide vocational/career education and training for secondary level handicapped students. Most of these certification programs require predominently vocational education training with special education emphasis. Other training programs contain predominently special education coursework and certification with add-on hours in vocational education, rehabilitation, counseling, or industrial arts. No one approach has been demonstrated as having more effectiveness or more impact on the handicapped than others. Apparently the choice of one model over another lies in the availability of resources and in the training and orientation of the teacher educators within the state who are instrumental in establishing the certification. Two models with opposite orientations, vocational education and special education, are presented in this section.

Vocational Education Orientation

The State of Nebraska offers an endorsement and certification in vocational special needs which reflects the training efforts of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) under the direction of Gary Meers. This certification strives to develop professional competencies in (a) program planning, (b) curriculum development, (c) instructional methodology, (d) evaluation, (e) guidance, (f) human relations, and (g) management of learning and behavior. The goals of the training program of UNL are to train professionals to:

1. Develop a realization in their students of the importance of staying in school,
2. Enable each student to work toward his/her maximum potential,
3. Develop an attitude that the indivdiual is a valued person,
4. Prepare students with saleable skills,
5. Develop the self-confidence necessary to take advantage of employment opportunities, and
6. Develop a desirable attitude toward the world of work.

At UNL nine semester hours are required for a special vocational needs endorsement and fifteen are required for full certification. Prerequisites for the program are a bachelor's degree and previously obtained teacher certification. All students are required to take the following courses:

1. Introduction to Special Vocational Needs (3 credit hours)
2. Development and Implementation of Special Vocational Needs Programs (3 credit hours)
3. Special Vocational Needs in Career Education (3 credit hours)

Students may select the remaining hours from the following, depending on their interests and the recommendations of the special vocational needs program specialist:

1. Psychology of Exceptional Children (3 credit hours)
2. School Resource Personnel as Consultants (3 credit hours)
3. Seminar in Habilitation of the Adolescent Mentally Retarded (2 credit hours)
4. Seminar in Psychology of Exceptional Children (2 credit hours)
5. General and Specific Learning Disabilities (3 credit hours)

Several other states have comparable certification programs with some variation. This is due in part to the fact that special vocational needs

specialists from Nebraska have been consultants to these states and their training institutions. These states are in various stages of development toward having an endorsement or certification in special vocational needs.

Special Education Orientation

Training programs with major emphasis in special education with add-on coursework in vocational/career education exist in most major training institutions. This orientation offers certification in a categorical exceptionality with emphasis on the secondary level. No states have reported the availability of a special education certification with major emphasis in vocational/career education for the handicapped, as opposed to major emphasis in an exceptionality. However, many personnel training programs in special education do have an emphasis in vocational/career education for the handicapped that leads to certification in an exceptionality such as mental retardation. Fort Hays State University is an example of such a program.

The special education program at Fort Hays State University in Hays, Kansas offers a master's degree in vocational/career education for the handicapped leading to certification in secondary level mental retardation. The primary purpose of this program is to prepare personnel to establish vocational/career education and training for the handicapped in public and special purpose schools. Graduates of the program are prepared to develop, implement, and coordinate a program that involves community employers, regular/special/vocational educators, agency personnel, handicapped students, and parents. This program interfaces formal coursework and intensive practicum experiences. Practicum experiences, "personalized" to be a designated geographical or employment community, are designed to benefit not only the graduate student but also the community in which

performance competencies are completed. Students accepted into the program are expected to provide this for their designated community through the acquisition of a variety of performance and informational competencies emphasizing career/vocational education and training for the handicapped.

The program is oriented toward a task analytical approach in the collection and assessment of requirements relative to adult living goals and specific jobs within a geographical or employment community. These requirements are used as the basis of exceptional student skill evaluation, vocational training curriculum, and pre-vocational curriculum. Additionally, task analysis is applied to regular and vocational education curricula to assist in adaptations and alterations in meeting individual student needs. Thus, students in the master's program are taught observation, analytical, instructional, and coordination skills that are used to develop and implement vocational/career education and training for the handicapped.

The following courses are required to be taken in sequence for the program:

1. Introduction to Exceptional Children and Youth (3 credit hours)
2. Introduction to Vocational/Career Education for the Handicapped (1 credit hour)
3. Seminar in Special Education: Legal Aspects (2 credit hours)
4. School/Community Relations (3 credit hours)
5. Practicum I: School/Community Screening and Analysis (3 credit ours)
6. Practicum II: Vocational Evaluation--Development and Interpretation (3 credit hours)

7. Counseling Parents of Exceptional Children and Youth (3 credit hours)
8. Vocational/Career Coordination and Implementation (3 credit hours)
9. Practicum III: Curriculum Development--Methods and Materials (3 credit hours)
10. Practicum IV: Total Program Implementation (3 credit hours)
11. Research in Special Education: Vocational/Career Education for the Handicapped (3 credit hours)

Summary

The current state of the art of certification in vocational/career education for the handicapped and/or special needs students has been discussed by presenting (a) trends in teacher certification and personnel preparation, (b) guidelines for change, and (c) example programs. In summation, there is movement toward more certification programs with the most change occurring in vocational education as compared to special education and vocational rehabilitation. This development has been manifested in endorsements in vocational special needs. Interagency collaboration, professional organization involvement, and professional attitudes that depart from turfism are key factors in encouraging and facilitating an increased number of certification programs.

Conclusions

The state of the art in certification of personnel who serve secondary level handicapped students is in a stage of infancy compared to other areas of certification involving teachers of the handicapped. There is an increasing number of states that offer endorsement in vocational needs and emphasis in secondary level special education as attachments to an initial certification in vocational education and special education. No states offer full certification as an entity in vocational special needs and/or vocational/career education for the handicapped. It appears that future developments will be a continuation of current practices as opposed to specific and full certification in the previously mentioned areas. It may be concluded that (a) such a certification is not necessary, or (b) if such a certification is necessary, the state of the art is in a pre-emergent state with much work to be completed on the national and state levels.

It is difficult for anyone to predict what the future holds with the impending cuts in federal support. Any and all cuts will obviously have a ripple effect on all concerned including training institutions' offerings and consequent certification programs. Development of new certification programs for professionals who serve secondary level handicapped students will, in all probability, be deferred. It is hoped that the motivation and dedication which brought us to our present state of the art, even though minimal, will not decrease along with the funding.

References

Albright, L., Hasazi, S. E., Phelps, L. A., & Hull, M. E. Interagency collaboration in providing vocational education for handicapped individuals. Exceptional Children, 1981, 47, 584-589.

Brock, R. J. Preparing vocational and special education personnel to work with special needs students--State of the art 1977-79. Menomonie, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin-Stout, 1979.

Clark, G. M., & Olverson, B. S. Education of secondary personnel: Aspiration and preliminary data. Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 541-546.

Commissioner's joint memorandum on formal cooperative agreements between special education, vocational rehabilitation, and vocational education programs to maximize services to handicapped individuals. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, November 21, 1978.

Federal Register, Part VI. Vocational education, state programs, and commissioner's discretionary programs. October 3, 1977.

Federal Register, Position statement on comprehensive vocational education for handicapped persons. September 25, 1978.

Heller, H. W. Secondary education for handicapped students: In search of a solution. Exceptional Children, 1981, 47, 582-583.

Miller, S. R. Secondary programming. In D. A. Sabatino (Ed.), Learning disabilities handbook: A technical guide to program development. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1975.

Miller, S. R., Sabatino, D. A., & Larsen, R. P. Issues in the professional preparation of secondary school special educators. Exceptional Children, 1980, 46, 344-350.